W.S.

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY

Annual Report for 1908

THE

National League for the Protection of the Family.

President.

Hon. SETH LOW, LL.D., New York.

Vice-Presidents.

Rt. Rev. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D.D., LL.D., Boston.

Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D.D., Cambridge.

Corresponding Secretary.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

Treasurer.

WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, Care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston.

Executive Committee.

Pres. W. E. HUNTINGTON, Ph.D., LL.D., Newton Center.

Pres. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Amherst.

Prof. ALBION W. SMALL, Ph.D., LL.D., Chicago.

Rev. DANIEL MERRIMAN, D.D., Worcester.

EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston.

FRANK GAYLORD COOK, Esq., Cambridge.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

REPORT

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

FOR THE

YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1908

BOSTON:
THE FORT HILL PRESS
176–184 HIGH STREET
1909

Notes.

1. Our Reports for the years 1890, 1892, 1897, and 1901–7 are the only ones that can now be supplied. The Report for 1905 is a "Review of Twenty-Five Years," giving a summary of the movement regarding the family and our work for that period, and will be freely sent to all who ask for it.

2. The paper of the Corresponding Secretary read before the Congress of Arts and Science in St. Louis on the "Problem of the Family," and a report of twenty pages of a committee with Prof. A. R. Merriam, chairman, made to the National Council of Congregational Churches in October, has been reprinted from the minutes of the Council and will also be sent to those who desire it.

3. The Report of the Census Office on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and some twenty foreign countries can be had on application to the Hon. S. N. D. North, director of the Census, Washington, D. C. The second part of the report, containing only the general tables for the United States, and a Bulletin of seventy-one pages summarizing it for general circulation, were ready in December. Part I, containing the analyses, tables, summary of the statutes of this and other countries, and the statistics for the foreign countries will appear in the early months of 1909.

4. The Secretary of the League will prepare for the use of the League a summary of the Government Report, which practically covers forty years, with some special studies of points of interest. This cannot be ready until late in the spring, but all applications for it will be placed on file and met at the earliest possible date. Two gentlemen have generously provided for this issue.

5. The attention of all is invited to the report of the Treasurer and the great need it shows of immediate and generous aid for our work.

Every friend of the home is invited to give us a modest place, at least, in his annual charities. The work of all benevolent societies is aided by everything that is done for the home. The League needs an immediate endowment. A form of bequest may be found on the third page of the cover.

6. Associate Annual Membership is offered to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of five dollars for the year, to be renewed at the pleasure of the subscriber. Such members are members in full for the time.

7. The Treasurer, Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston, Mass., will gladly acknowledge all contributions. All other correspondence should be addressed to Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Auburndale, Mass., to whom contributions may also be sent.

Minutes.

BOSTON, January 20, 1909.

The annual meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family was held at the Diocesan House, No. 1 Joy Street, Boston, on Wednesday, January 20, 1909, at 3 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., and Mr. Everett O. Fisk was elected Temporary Chairman in the absence of the Vice-President. Prayer was offered by Rev. S. W. Dike. George P. Dike, Esq., was chosen Recording Secretary, *pro tempore*. The Vice-President, the Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, then took the chair.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved. Dr. Dike then read letters from absent members. The annual report of the Treasurer, Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, was read and approved and referred to Mr. Fisk as Auditor.

Dr. Dike then read extracts from his annual report as Corresponding Secretary. It was voted to accept the report, the same to be printed and distributed under the direction of the Corresponding Secretary.

The following officers were elected for the ensuing year:

President, Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York.

Vice-Presidents, Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston; Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge.

Corresponding Secretary, Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Auburndale.

Recording Secretary,

Executive Committee, Pres. William E. Huntington, LL.D., Newton Center; Pres. George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst; Prof. Albion W. Small, LL.D., Chicago; Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Boston; Mr. Everett O. Fisk, Boston; Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., Cambridge; Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Auburndale.

Voted to adjourn.

GEORGE P. DIKE,
Recording Secretary pro tempore.

Report of the Corresponding Secretary.

THE year as a whole has been a quiet one in our work. But it has been marked by two events of especial importance for us. One of these is the issue of the second part of the Report of the Census Office on Marriage and Divorce, with a Bulletin giving a summary of its material. The other is the discussion of the Family during the entire meeting of the American Sociological Society at Atlantic City in December.

LEGISLATION.

As this was the year when few legislatures were in session, little legislation was attempted, and none of any importance was secured. A movement, in which it was hoped that the Civic Federation of Honolulu would be able to secure an improvement in the divorce laws of Hawaii this winter, has been begun. In South Dakota, the opponents of the act of 1907, which aimed to do away with the scandals that have been connected with that state, obtained its submission to the popular vote at the election in November, with a view to defeat it. But they themselves were defeated by a large majority and the law now becomes effective. It provides that the plaintiff in a divorce suit must be an actual resident in good faith in the state for one year, and in the county for three months, before he can bring his suit for divorce. An exception is made in the interest of parties who have been married in the state and have lived in it ever since. The act also provides that all hearings of divorce cases shall be had at a regular term of court. This probably ends the scandal that for many years has been connected with South Dakota, but which, as will be shown further on in this report, has been magnified far beyond the facts. Utah in 1907 enacted a law which escaped notice in our report for that year, prohibiting the marriage of a person afflicted with either of the two chief venereal diseases. This touches one of the most serious problems before the legislator, and the experiment will be watched with interest by those who are aware of the baleful effects of the marriage of this class of persons.

THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

We are able to announce the publication by the Census Office, just before the close of the year, of the second part of its report on Marriage and Divorce, in a quarto volume of 840 pages, and also a Bulletin of 71 pages, summarizing its chief contents. The first part, containing the analyses of the general tables, a summary of the statutes, and the material relating to some twenty foreign countries, will probably appear within a few weeks or possibly months.

This work not only brings the report of 1889 down to date, but, as that report is now out of print, incorporates the material of that document in it, making it a report on marriage and divorce in the greater part of the civilized world for forty years — from 1867 to 1906 inclusive — in this country, and for all or considerable portions of the entire period for foreign countries. It lays on the broadest practicable scale the foundations for a scientific study of the subjects of which it treats so far as it is possible to bring the official data within the range of a statistical investigation. The first part, which is confined to general tables for this country, is all that can be expected of such a work, presenting its facts in the clearest manner for the general reader as well as for the special student. The volume that is to follow, covering a wider range of subjects of great value for comparative study, will undoubtedly be equally satisfactory.

The report of 1889, which was prepared by the Department of Labor, proved one of the most widely interesting reports that was issued by that office under the Hon. Carroll D. Wright. This one, which has had the advice and coöperation of Mr. Wright, cannot fail of being regarded with still greater favor. Since both reports were originally proposed and largely secured by the League, we may well take satisfaction in this latest result of our efforts in the direction of adequate statistics. These reports may now confidently be expected to be followed every twenty, or better, every ten years, with others along the same lines.

Those who desire the Bulletin to which reference has been made can obtain it by writing to the Hon. S. N. D. North, director of the Census, Washington, D. C. The full report can also be had by investigators and special students, and perhaps others.

Two gentlemen have given us one hundred dollars to meet the expense of printing a summary of the entire report in a form convenient for mailing to our friends and any interested. It is proposed to make this special issue a fuller summary in many details than the official Bulletin and to include many matters relating to this country

which that Bulletin does not note, as well as of the foreign material which is not considered at all in that. This document of ours cannot be ready until well along in the spring, but all applications for it will be filed and answered as soon as possible.

A FEW OF THE LEADING FACTS ALREADY BROUGHT OUT.

Marriage statistics for the entire country are now given for the first time, but are still incomplete. It is surprising that in the present wide lack of provision for the record of marriages trustworthy figures can be given on this point for the country as a whole. The marriage rate per thousand of population, the usual way of computing it, was 9.3 in the year 1900 for the entire country, having risen from 9.1 in 1890. As marriages fluctuate a good deal with financial conditions, these figures cannot be taken as showing that gain in the ten years.

The rate varies, too, with the section of country, it being the lowest in the North Atlantic states, including New England, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, where it was 8.2 in the last ten years covered by the investigation. In this division, Pennsylvania is the lowest, having a rate of only 7.5, which may be partly due to less complete returns. In the North Atlantic division, which includes the twelve states of the middle West, the rate for the last two decades was 9.2 and 9.1. In the South Atlantic division the rates are 8.6 and 9.7 for the two decades. In the South Central, extending from Kentucky to Texas, the ratios are high, rising to 10.4 and 11.1 for the two decades, Arkansas giving 12.1 and 13.2.

It will be noticed that the marriage rate is lowest in the more advanced parts of the country and highest in the more recently settled sections and in the South. The registration reports of the states that give data on this point show very clearly that both the marriage and birth rates are lowest among the so-called native stock. Probably throughout the country the marriage and birth rates are the highest among the negroes and people of foreign birth. As a whole the marriage rate in the United States is said in the report to be higher than in any European country with one or two exceptions. The facts will be brought out in the part of the report that is to come later.

THE GREAT INCREASE OF DIVORCE.

As we have long suspected, the increase in divorce has continued to be very great and widely spread over the country. There were 9,937 divorces in the United States proper in 1867, and 72,062 in 1906, or more than seven times as many as there were forty years ago. Forty

years ago there were many people who said that the increase that had then been noticed was due to the Civil War, and that after a little time there would be no marked increase. Every one of the forty years shows an increase over the preceding year, and the movement in periods of five years is pretty uniform. In the first twenty years there were in all 328,716 divorces granted, and in the last twenty years the number was 945,625. Taking the movement by decades, the Bulletin says: " An increase of 30 per cent in the population between the years 1870 and 1880 was accompanied with an increase of 79 per cent in the number of divorces granted. In the next decade, 1880 to 1890, the population increased 25 per cent and the divorces 70 per cent, and in the following decade, 1890 to 1900, an increase of 21 per cent in population was accompanied with an increase of 66 per cent in the number of divorces. In the six years from 1900 to 1906, population, as estimated, increased 10.5 per cent and divorces 29.3 per cent. It thus appears that at the end of the forty-year period divorces were increasing about three times as fast as population, while in the first decade they increased only about two and two-thirds as fast."

Connecticut and Utah are the only states that show a decrease for the entire last decade over the entire first decade of the forty years. It is to be noted that no less than nine states show some decrease in the year 1906 over the year 1905. Whether this improvement is to be kept up or is only temporary remains to be seen. It is clear, however, that the rate of increase has been retarded or stopped in a few of the states where most attention has been given to efforts at reform in legislation and public sentiment.

THE DIVORCE RATE.

On the basis of population there were 29 divorces per 100,000 population in 1870. The number was 38 in 1880; it became 53 in 1890 and 73 in 1900, while it was 82 in 1905. The highest rate in 1900 was in the state of Washington, which had 187 divorces to the 100,000 of population. The next highest that year was in Montana, with 167, while Colorado came next with 158. Indiana followed with 142. Then came Arkansas with 136, Oregon with 134, and Texas with 131. Delaware had the lowest divorce rate in the country, it being only 16 in 1900. Of course South Carolina had none. Some of the New England states have a high rate. Maine leads them with 117; New Hampshire has 112; Rhode Island, 105; Vermont, 75; Massachusetts, only 47, and Connecticut, which was supposed a generation ago to share with Indiana the reputation of being the worst state in the country had only 50. It is supposed that the ratio of divorces to marriages for the entire country is now about 1 to 12.

DURATION OF MARRIAGE BEFORE DIVORCE.

The report of 1889 brought out the surprising fact that the average length of time between marriage and divorce for the country was then 9.17 years. In the last twenty years the average length has become 9.9 years, a very considerable increase. A study of the statistics shows that a smaller percentage of people are seeking divorce in the first year or two of married life, while a great deal larger percentage seek it after being married for many years. For, while 7.8 per cent of all the divorced persons in the first twenty years had been married twenty-one years and over, those of this class in the last twenty years had become 10.1 per cent of the total number divorced. In the nine states of the North Atlantic division the number of this class in the last twenty years had become 12.7 per cent of the whole number. On first thought it may be considered a gain that those seeking divorce do not in so many cases have children to be involved in the affair and that a shorter period of life is saddened by domestic infelicity. But further reflection will disclose a sad feature in that people who have lived twenty-one years and more together have so allowed themselves to grow apart that even at a late period in life they are willing to separate permanently. This shows a weakened sense of moral obligation and a decay of the finer feelings that bodes little good.

DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE.

While there is little direct light on this point, yet what we have is of significance. The average time between the separation of the people who are divorced and the granting of the decree in the last twenty years was 3.2 years for the country and 4 years for the North Atlantic divisions. This shows that another marriage is by no means the immediate sequence, even if it is the aim of most divorces, and that probably large numbers of the divorced do not marry again. The registration reports of Connecticut show that for a number of years the divorced persons married in a year are only about forty per cent of the number divorced in the same year. The figures of Rhode Island are said to be still more significant in the same direction.

INTEMPERANCE AND DIVORCE.

The popular notion that intemperance is the cause of most divorces is not very well supported by the investigation. For it appeared in any way in only 20.4 per cent of the cases in the first twenty years and in 19.5 per cent in the last twenty years. Its decrease is encouraging, though it may be slow. Curiously, 20.3 per cent of the divorces in

Maine were granted in the last twenty years for intemperance. It was a direct cause in 20.8 per cent of the cases granted to the wife and an indirect cause in 11.7 per cent. In New Hampshire the divorces for intemperance as a direct cause were 12 per cent of the total and those for it as an indirect cause, 9.2 per cent. In Massachusetts only 12.4 per cent were granted for intemperance. In Connecticut intemperance was a direct cause in 25.5 per cent of the cases granted to the wife and an indirect cause in 5 per cent. In Vermont, which does not allow divorce for intemperance, it appears as an indirect cause only, and in 2.5 per cent of all the cases.

The figures for the other causes of divorce will not be discussed here except to say that the technical causes are a poor guide to the real reasons for divorce. The cause alleged in a petition for divorce is generally the one the petitioner thinks can be most easily established and with the least disagreeable consequences. Desertion, cruelty, and non-support are increasing as causes, but they also probably serve to conceal divorce by mutual consent and for many trivial reasons, as well as trouble due to sexual matters.

MIGRATION FOR EASY DIVORCE.

Some of the data for drawing conclusions from a comparison of the place of marriage with that of divorce are not accessible until the appearance of the coming part of the report. It need only be said here that nearly four fifths of all the divorced are divorced in the same state in which their marriage took place on an average of ten years before the divorce, and that a somewhat larger proportion of the population of the country was born in another state than the one in which they live.

But the statistics for the last twenty years, when studied carefully, are extremely interesting for their correction of popular notions. Take the Dakotas for an example. So far from South Dakota being the worst state in the country for divorce, no less than twenty-one states or territories had a worse record in 1906 than South Dakota, and North Dakota stands a little better still. South Dakota had only 95 divorces per 100,000 population in 1906, and North Dakota 88, even Ohio, Iowa, Michigan, and three New England states, as well as many others, having a higher divorce rate. Probably the ratios to married couples will change this order of states a little.

The explanation of this surprising result, which some of us expected, is worth giving. The old territorial law allowed divorce in the Dakotas after ninety days' residence. This was continued under the state constitutions until, in 1899, North Dakota raised the term to one year,

and a little later South Dakota made it six months. Considerable numbers flocked to both states from outside. But the tables show that this illicit business was largely confined to three or four counties in each state, while the rest of the state shows a nearly normal rate. Mr. J. L. Coulter showed this for North Dakota in the *Journal of Sociology* for November, 1906. Minnehaha County, in South Dakota, containing Sioux Falls, did the greater part of the business. It granted 1,124 divorces in the twenty years ending with 1906, which was 1 to 3.6 marriages in the same time. One hundred and thirty-four of these were in the single year 1906, or 1 divorce that year to 2.2 marriages. Lincoln County granted 64 in 1906, or 1 divorce to 1.6 marriages, and the ratio was 1 to 4.1 for the twenty years. But no other counties in the state seem to show any extraordinary divorce rate. In other cases, such as Newport, R. I., Chicago, and some counties in Pennsylvania, the reputed magnitudes dwindle to small proportions. The raising of the term of residence in several states and in all the territories in the last twenty years has probably reduced migratory divorces to very small proportions. Gen. F. A. Walker once said that the disclosure of the single fact that 80 per cent of all the divorces in the country had been granted in the state where the parties had been married more than paid the cost of the report of 1889. For it had supplied the needed information that settled the question of a constitutional amendment on the subject.

OTHER TOPICS.

Only 15 per cent of the cases were contested and the Bulletin says that in many of these the contest was hardly more than a formality. Alimony was asked by the wife in 18 per cent of the cases, and granted in 12.7 per cent. The husband sought in it 2.8 per cent and obtained it in 2 per cent. There were no children in 60 per cent of the cases. Where there were any, the average number was 1.9 per family, a little lower than in the first twenty years. It is probable that there were children in many of the cases not reported. From the meager returns as to occupations of the divorced, a little can be learned. In New Jersey, where the returns on the point are more full than elsewhere, among actors, showmen, etc., there is 1 divorce to every 6 persons engaged in those occupations. Among commercial travelers, 1 to every 9; among musicians, physicians, bartenders, and telegraph and telephone operators it is 1 to 22, 23, or 24; among farmers, 1 to 92. Among those in trade and transportation, it is 1 to 44, and in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits it is 1 to 66.

It is unfortunate that we have no means of determining the rates among the colored population of the South, — which very good opinion

there puts at 75 per cent of the whole, — or to get at the rates for different nationalities and religions, as is possible in some foreign countries. We should like to know, too, in how many cases reconciliations are effected or attempted by the judges. The effort at reconciliation, which is a voluntary matter with the courts in this country, is obligatory by law in some European countries and often effective in a considerable proportion of the cases, as very likely the next part of the report will show. But we leave this and most of the matter we would like to present to our special issue after all the United States Census report is in our hands.

MIGRATORY MARRIAGES.

We have more than once alluded to the serious extent to which people go away from their own place of residence to be married, and especially to other states. New Jersey was formerly notorious for its Camden marriages. It then had no marriage license law, and many from Philadelphia and vicinity crossed over to Camden to be married without license. There were for two years an average of 4,785 marriages each year in Camden county, or about sixty-eight per thousand of population, or six or seven times the normal proportion. In the next two years, after the enactment of a marriage license law, the marriages in that county averaged only 1,083, or little more than one fifth what they had been. Wisconsin is another state where the immigration for marriage has been restricted. It introduced a marriage license law in 1899 and required that the license issue at least five days before the marriage. Milwaukee marriages fell off nearly forty per cent and those for the state were about fifteen per cent less, while at the same time marriages in Michigan, to which the runaways and their kind then resorted, increased almost as much as the loss in Wisconsin less the increase in Chicago, where probably more stayed at home to be married. St. Joseph, Mich., now has an abnormally high marriage rate. So far the attempt of Michigan people to pass the Wisconsin law has not succeeded.

Some of the leading citizens of Rhode Island have become much interested in the effort to check the influx of people from Massachusetts into that state for marriage, and probably this winter will see an earnest effort to secure the necessary legislation.

These instances are given to show what Prof. George E. Howard calls a greater evil than migratory divorces, and how the way is often open for a remedy of the evils that grow out of the diverse laws of the states by the adoption of some simple provision. Probably renewed efforts will be made this winter to secure the enactment of the Uniform

Divorce Law proposed two years ago by the Divorce Congress and already adopted in New Jersey and Delaware. It is intended to follow this by a uniform marriage law if possible. A uniform law to prevent Family Desertion and Non-Support is being prepared.

A SIGNIFICANT MEETING.

The use of all the seven sessions of the annual meeting of the American Sociological Society at Atlantic City, N. J., the last days of the year, for the discussion of the various aspects of the problem of the Family, either by itself or in joint meetings with the American Statistical Association, or the American Economic Society, is a sign of the times in our field. It is a recognition by learned societies, as well as by the great universities, of the importance in social science and public welfare of the Family. The papers, when published in full, in the *American Journal of Sociology*, Chicago, Ill., will be of great value in showing the currents of opinion on the subject.

It is hoped that the paper of Dr. Prince A. Morrow, of New York, on the relation of sexual disease to the Family will be widely read. No other paper attracted so much serious attention. It presented its matter in a most admirable way and won the approval of all who heard it. The movement to meet this evil, to which we referred in our report for 1906, is making progress in a healthy way.

A NEW STAGE IN THE DISCUSSION OF THE FAMILY.

It is apparent to the close observer that this meeting at Atlantic City, and the way in which some are treating the facts brought out in the government report, indicate that we are soon to meet with most strenuous objection in some quarters to the belief which most thoughtful people who have coöperated with us hold to the effect that this enormous volume of divorce is an evil. There will soon come a period in which we must expect to hear much from a class who maintain that social evolution as it is now going on has produced this increase of divorce and that it is in the main a wholesome movement and to be encouraged. This came out at Atlantic City and has been cropping out in other places for years. But it is likely to become strong soon. And the universality, almost complete, probably, of the divorce movement throughout the world will be used as a reason for the belief. As a consequence we shall get little encouragement in our efforts at reform from that class of people, either in legal or social ways. The position of the churches will be easily set aside and the desire of many will be to drift.

Now all parties must face this situation, and let us hope that it will be done intelligently and fairly. We must understand and appreciate each other. The extreme churchman must look at the position of scientific men squarely, and the scientific men need to understand and appreciate the position of Christian scholars who, with the fullest acceptance of the evolutionary theory of society, nevertheless believe in the power of human choice to produce great mutations in its development. For as we rise in the scale of being into those regions where human freedom comes into a large place, we must take into account its influence in changing the currents of what otherwise would be a drift as steady as that of a great river. We need to remember that nowhere else has the power of human choice done more to change the course of things than in regard to this institution of the Family. It was Woolsey, of Yale, who said that the words of Jesus regarding divorce had influenced society more than any others he ever uttered. That the institutions of marriage and divorce have been widely and profoundly molded by Christian thought is beyond question. And that they will continue to be follows as a matter of course.

ACTION OF THE CHURCH.

The Interdenominational Church Committee on the subject has held one meeting during the year and confirmed the action hitherto taken by that body. But it did little else of importance. The Federated Council of Churches, at its Philadelphia meeting in December, adopted a series of resolutions recognizing the duty of the Church to guard and preserve the integrity and purity of the Family, urging its branches to enforce more consistently " the Scripture rule regarding the remarriage of divorced persons," and also advocating joint action in all matters looking to the preservation of the Family and Christian home.

All this is good so far as it goes. But to our mind, as our work all these years as a League shows, we need to do a great deal more, and the discussions at Atlantic City show the necessity of this. The Church and the scientific men need to find larger common standing ground. And let us not refuse to see that this is not to be sought in the dogmas of the Church or in mere traditional interpretations of Scripture as having the force of law. It is interesting to see the way in which Jesus himself, in the classic utterance on divorce in Mark 10 : 3–9, went back of tradition, back of Moses, to nature itself, and made every one of his four or five points concerning marriage turn on some fact of nature, saying at the end that what God has thus wrought into nature you are to find and preserve, not necessarily as the legislation of the

state, perhaps not as the rule of the Church, for Jesus was here as everywhere pointing to principles and not laying down laws, but as a great guiding principle, to be realized in the Church and society as fast as they come to grasp his ideal and are able to lay hold of it in life.

The League has always stood for the utmost catholicity in the doctrine of the Family, so that all who would see the domestic life of our people improved can work together; its Secretary hints here for the first time in his reports at a personal opinion on a point over which the Christian world has widely differed. But this is done not to advance a theory, but to urge the great importance of seeing that we must all see the importance of recognizing that the divorce question cannot be made in these days to turn on the mere authority of ecclesiastical bodies or on the quotation of texts of Scripture as the final word, but that we must go with the scientists to nature, where Jesus himself went, and carefully listen to what comes to us from her. Probably this is what the Church, at least a great part of it, means to do. But have we not so long cast our conclusions from our study of nature in the mold of dogma and traditional language and conceptions that we have lost something of the profounder significance of the words of Jesus when he points to nature and to that only for his real doctrine concerning marriage? And shall we not find in a return to nature that broad ground where we can ask our companions in study, the scientists, to take their position with us? Or, to put it in the other way, should we not see that they are not far from the true source of knowledge, though they may not yet have reached it fully?

One of the greatest difficulties with all the discussion of the divorce question has ever been the fact that there has been too little recognition of the importance and, indeed, the necessity of finding an adequate common ground for the scientific and practical people on the one side and the religious people who rest on authority on the other. The objection which scientific men in the name of sociology are raising to reform in respect to divorce may be a most opportune thing if it shall lead the advocates of reform to study the subject anew with the aim to find solid ground where all parties must stand and can stand intelligently.

THE GREAT WORK OF THE CHURCH AND SOCIETY.

This is educational and inspirational towards the highest ideals, an idea that has always had a large place in the work of the League. We may fulminate about divorce, and should say a great deal about it. But our chief dependence must be on education of the people in regard to the place and work of the Family in church and society, and this

must be supported by concrete work. More instruction from the pulpit on the duties, the privileges and the discipline in all that makes character, which the Home affords, is greatly needed. The public school teacher complains that the Home is not doing its part in the work of education. The employer of labor complains that the workman is not trained at home in honest work and in steadiness of purpose. The political reformer finds that he is demanding an integrity that the Home does not supply in sufficient degree. Almost all along the entire line of social activity the complaint of the thoughtful is coming to the effect that there are too many weaknesses in our home life.

Now the Church is the proper leader of reform in these directions. Great as are the industrial needs of working men and women, their need of that sort of sympathy and aid that will give them the spiritual qualities of the best home life is greater still. While the Church is attending to the labor problem, as it is called, let it not forget the interests which Labor has in a home of the highest spiritual value. Nor let Capital forget that it has no more important interest than that which lies in the improvement of the home life of all our people.

Attention is called to the report of the Treasurer on the next page.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. DIKE,
Corresponding Secretary.

Treasurer's Report.

RECEIPTS		$1,877 90
EXPENDITURES:		
Rent	$50 00	
Postage	36 50	
Traveling	81 65	
Stationery	50	
Telephone	4 00	
Printing	70 25	
Typewriter	55	
Express	40	
Almanac	35	244 20
		$1,633 70
Salary of S. W. Dike	$1,800.00	
Deficit for year ending December 31, 1908		$166 30
Deficit for year ending December 31, 1907		139 12
Deficit for year ending December 31, 1906		42 95
Amount of debt, January 1, 1909		$348 37

JANUARY 21, 1909.

I have this day examined the foregoing accounts of the Treasurer, since January 25, 1908, with the vouchers for the same, and find them correct.

EVERETT O. FISK, *Auditor.*

CONTRIBUTIONS.

Jan.	1.	Mrs. Wallace H. Camp, Waterbury, Conn	$50 00	
	3.	Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York, N. Y.	50 00	
	16.	"A Vermont Lady"	100 00	
	16.	Mrs. William E. Dodge, New York, N. Y.	100 00	
	20.	President William E. Huntington, LL.D., Newton Center,	5 00	
	22.	Rev. S. P. Leeds, D.D., Hanover, N. H.	2 00	
	24.	John D. R. Lamson, Toledo, Ohio	10 00	
	24.	Frank Gaylord Cook, Cambridge	2 00	
	25.	Mrs. George Ripley, Andover	10 00	
	28.	E. H. Ellison, Newton	5 00	
	31.	Professor Austin B. Bassett, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	5 00	
	31.	First Congregational Church, Newton Center	10 00	
	31.	"Friends," Thompson, Conn.	10 00	
		Received in January		$359 00
Feb.	8.	Alfred T. White, Brooklyn, N. Y.	$10 00	
	10.	Rt. Rev. John Scarborough, D.D., LL.D., Trenton, N. J.,	10 00	
	10.	Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge	10 00	
	10.	Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston	5 00	
	11.	Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence, R. I.	10 00	

Feb.	11.	Hon. Moses Giddings, Bangor, Me.	$5 00	
	11.	Rev. Daniel H. Tribou, Philadelphia, Penn.	1 00	
	12.	Rev. W. S. Smith, Worcester.	5 00	
	12.	President Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., Washington, D.C.	10 00	
	13.	Rev. John Phelps Taylor, D.D., Andover	10 00	
	15.	Rev. W. P. Alcott, Boxford	2 00	
	15.	Rt. Rev. Chauncey Brewster, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	3 00	
	15.	Rt. Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, D.D., LL.D., St. Louis, Mo.	5 00	
	15.	St. Bartholemew's Church, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	17.	First Baptist Church, Newton Center	20 00	
	18.	Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
	18.	Rev. George B. Johnson, Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
	19.	State Street Congregational Church, Portland, Me.	10 00	
	22.	Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain	5 00	
	22.	Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester	5 00	
	22.	Mrs. Charlotte F. Blackman, Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
	22.	Dr. Lucien Howe, Buffalo, N. Y.	5 00	
	22.	Professor Edward Y. Hincks, D.D., Andover	5 00	
	24.	Mrs. John S. Mitchell, Waterbury, Conn.	50 00	
	26.	James C. Braman, Auburndale	10 00	
	26.	St. Agnes Chapel, Trinity Parish, New York, N. Y.	10 00	
	29.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston	25 00	
	29.	St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia, Penn.	10 00	
	29.	Hon. Edward W. Frost, Milwaukee, Wis.	5 00	
		Total received in February		$291 00
Mar.	4.	Rev. Ernest J. Dennen, Lynn	$5 00	
	7.	Rt. Rev. Alexander H. Vinton, D.D., Springfield	5 00	
	7.	Mrs. Morris K. Jesup, New York, N. Y.	10 00	
	7.	Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale	10 00	
	9.	Mrs. William G. Benedict, Boston	5 00	
	9.	William B. Taylor, Lynn	5 00	
	10.	Rev. Arthur Lawrence, D.D., Stockbridge	25 00	
	11.	Old South Church, Boston	25 00	
	12.	" W. G. S.," Philadelphia, Penn.	5 00	
	16.	C. E. Clift, Boston	5 00	
	17.	Appleton P. Williams, West Upton	2 50	
	18.	Professor Henry W. Farnun, R.P.D., New Haven, Conn.	25 00	
	21.	" A Friend," Redlands, Cal.	3 00	
		Total received in March		$130 50
Apr.	2.	Christ Church, Hartford, Conn.	$10 00	
	3.	Miss Martha C. Burgess, Dedham	5 00	
	10.	Professor Walter F. Willcox, LL.D., Ithaca, N. Y.	5 00	
	11.	Rt. Rev. W. H. Hare, D.D., Sioux City, S. D.	5 00	
	21.	Broadway Tabernacle Church, New York, N. Y.	10 00	
	24.	Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh, N. C.	5 00	
	24.	George Burnham, Sr., Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
		Total received in April		$65 00
May	20.	Stuart Wood, Philadelphia, Penn.	$15 00	
	20.	Rt. Rev. W. N. McVickar, D.D., LL.D., Providence, R. I.	10 00	
		Total received in May		$25 00
June	6.	W. P. Blake, Boston	$5 00	
	17.	Charles Morris Smith, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	18.	Rev. Walker Gwynne, Summit, N. J.	2 00	
	30.	Hon. James Tillinghast, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
		Total received in June		$27 00

July	2.	Mrs. C. P. Turner, Philadelphia, Penn	$25 00	
	4.	N. H. Church Settlement Association	5 00	
	20.	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, Boston	10 00	
	22.	Samuel V. Hoffman, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	27.	Mrs. Richard H. Dana, Cambridge	5 00	
	30.	F. B. Marsh, New York, N. Y.	1 00	
		Total received in July	———	$71 00
Aug.	4.	Amelia H. Armstrong, Berkeley, Cal.	$1 00	
	26.	" Connecticut "	6 00	
	27.	Rev. Claudius B. Spencer, D.D., Kansas City, Mo.	5 00	
	29.	St. John's Parish, Stamford, Conn.	14 40	
		Total received in August	———	$26 40
Sept.	17.	Dr. William C. Rives, Washington, D. C.	$5 00	
	19.	Hon. J. P. Bates, Boston	10 00	
	19.	Rev. Cornelius B. Patton, D.D., Boston	5 00	
		Total received in September	———	$20 00
Oct.	12.	Herbert Wilder, Newton	$10 00	
	19.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester	10 00	
	20.	Rev. John H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown	10 00	
	20.	Hon. Frederick J. Kingsbury, LL.D., Waterbury, Conn.	25 00	
	22.	C. V. S. Remington, Fall River	5 00	
	22.	James C. Borden, Fall River	5 00	
	22.	Miss M. R. Hicks, Fall River	5 00	
	24.	Messrs. Ginn and Company, Boston	10 00	
		Total received in October	———	$80 00
Nov.	2.	Miss Lucy W. Burr, Auburndale	$25 00	
	5.	Rev. John G. Davenport, D.D., Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
	7.	Rt. Rev. Alexander Mackay-Smith, D.D., Philadelphia	15 00	
	10.	Rev. Samuel C. Bushnell, Arlington	5 00	
	12.	Edward P. Dutton, New York, N. Y.	5 00	
	12.	Mrs. Gilman C. Hill, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
	13.	St. John's Church, Providence, R. I.	20 00	
	13.	St. Stephen's Parish, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	13.	St. Stephen's Church, Pittsfield	10 00	
	16.	W. P. Henzey, Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
	21.	Rev. Horace Dutton, Auburndale	5 00	
	21.	Rev. W. C. Gordon, Ph.D., Auburndale	5 00	
	23.	George Burnham, Jr., Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
	24.	Arba N. Lincoln, Fall River	5 00	
	25.	Robert H. Gardiner, Boston	5 00	
	28.	Rathbone Gardner, Providence, R. I.	5 00	
	28.	Rev. W. H. Cobb, D.D., Newton Center	5 00	
	28.	Professor C. R. Henderson, D.D., Chicago, Ill.	2 00	
	28.	Professor Williston Walker, D.D., New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
	30.	Mrs. John S. Brigham, Worcester	5 00	
	30.	E. R. Brown, Dover, N. H.	5 00	
	30.	Miss Edith Woolsey, New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
	30.	Trinity Church, Boston	15 00	
		Total received in November	———	$222 00
Dec.	2.	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	$50 00	
	2.	Hon. Francis Lynde Stetson, LL.D., New York, N. Y.	30 00	
	2.	Arthur C. Farley, Auburndale	5 00	
	3.	First Church, Hartford, Conn.	10 00	

Dec.	3.	President William North Rice, LL.D., Middletown, Conn.	$5 00	
	3.	Wolcott H. Johnson, Boston	25 00	
	4.	Robert Treat Paine, Boston	5 00	
	4.	Professor Lewis B. Paton, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	10 00	
	4.	Hon. John E. Parsons, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	8.	Rev. James W. Bixler, D.D., New London, Conn.	10 00	
	10.	Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale	3 00	
	14.	Miss Grace H. Dodge, New York	100 00	
	14.	Miss M. Josephine Allen, Boston	5 00	
	14.	Arthur S. Johnson, Boston	10 00	
	15.	Arthur Reed Kimball, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
	15.	Church of the Ascension, New York	25 00	
	15.	"Friends," Thompson, Conn.	8 00	
	19.	President George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst	5 00	
	19.	R. S. Douglas, Brookline	5 00	
	21.	Mrs. David P. Kimball, Boston	25 00	
	21.	Rt. Rev. Frederick Burgess, D.D., Garden City, L. I.	5 00	
	22.	W. W. Lockwood, New York	5 00	
	23.	W. B. Herrick, Auburndale	10 00	
	23.	"Friends," Brookline	20 00	
	25.	Rev. W. H. van Allen, S.T.D., Boston	5 00	
	27.	Professor Theodore S. Woolsey, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	15 00	
	31.	"W. G. S.," Philadelphia, Penn.	5 00	
	31.	President William J. Tucker, D.D., LL.D., Hanover, N. H.	10 00	
	31.	Samuel W. Dike, Auburndale	100 00	
	31.	Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Boston	5 00	
	31.	St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia, Penn.	15 00	
		Total received in December		$561 00

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

ARTICLE I. This association shall be called the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY.

ART. II. Its object shall be, through the improvement of public sentiment and legislation, to protect the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce, and to secure its proper efficiency in individual and social life. It may cooperate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aims in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number.

ART. IV. The officers of this society shall be a President, not more than five Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the duties indicated in their several offices, to be elected at the Annual Meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The LEAGUE shall hold its Annual Meeting on the third Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and at such hour and place as shall be indicated in the call of the committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given in the call of any Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of two thirds of the members present.

COMMUNICATIONS concerning the work of the LEAGUE and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale, Mass.

CONTRIBUTIONS should be sent to the Treasurer, Mr. WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, care of E. J. Hovey & Co., Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY, a corporation created by the Laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successor or assigns, the sum of.....dollars, the principal [or income, as may be desired] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was organized.